DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 698 FL 005 720

AUTHOR Garvin, Paul L.
TITLE Linguistics as a Resource in Language Planning.
PUB DATE Jun 73
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Symposium on Sociolinguistics and Language Planning (Mexico City, Mexico, June-July, 1973)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Applied Linguistics; Language Development; *Language Planning; Language Role; Language Standardization; Linguistics; Linguistic Theory; Official Languages; Social Planning; *Sociolinguistics

ABSTRACT

Language planning involves decisions of two basic types: those pertaining to language choice and those pertaining to language development. Linguistic theory is needed to evaluate the structural suitability of candidate languages, since both official and national languages must have a high level of standardization as a cultural necessity. On the other hand, only a braodly conceived and functionally oriented linguistics can serve as a basis for choosing one language rather than another. The role of linguistics in the area of language development differs somewhat depending on whether development is geared in a technological and scientific or a literary, artistic direction. In the first case, emphasis is on the development of terminologies, and in the second case, on that of grammatical devices and styles. Linguistics can provide realistic and practical arguments in favor of language development, and a detailed, technical understanding of such development, as well as methodological skills. Linguists can and must function as consultants to those who actually make decisions about language planning. For too long linguists have pursued only those aims generated within their own field. They must now broaden their scope to achieve the kind of understanding of language that is necessary for a productive approach to concrete language problems. (Author/PP)

ED 095698

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

For presentation at:
Symposium on Sociolinguistics and Language Planning, held under the auspices of the Linguistic Society of America and the Interamerican Program for Linguistics and Language Teaching (PILEI) at the inter-American scientific meeting Science and Man in the Americas, organized by the Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnologia of Mexico and the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Mexico City, June-July 1973.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

LINGUISTICS AS A RESOURCE IN LANGUAGE PLANNING

Paul L. Garvin
State University of New York at Buffalo
President, Executive Committee
Interamerican Program for Linguistics and Language Teaching

Let me begin by defining my terms.

First of all, then, what is meant by the notion of "linguistics as a resource"? Why come up with a new term and not stick with the tried and true concept of "applied linguistics"?

The answer to this question is crucial since, as I see it, it has to do with the broader issue of the role of linguistics as a discipline in the face of the language problems of today's world.— Perhaps I could best make my view clearer by contrasting the two conceptions that I am here proposing to differentiate.

The concept of "applied linguistics" to me implies characteristically two basic attitudes.

The first of these is that there is already present in linguistics as we

FL 005 720

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

know it all that may be required for the solution of a given language problem and the only thing left to be done is to apply it. This attitude commonly leads to a frantic search of the linguistic literature in the hope of finding applicable insights. In the United States, it has been particularly prevalent in education--both in foreign language instruction and in the teaching of the language arts; it has resulted in a large amount of "linguistically oriented" materials of varying degrees of excellence or lack thereof, as a result of which "linguistics" has become either an O.K. word or anathema in educational circles.

The second basic attitude seems to be a consequence of, or at least related to, the first. This is that since applied linguistics is subsequent to basic research or theory in linguistics it is also in some way secondary--or even inferior--to it. While this attitude is not either logically or empirically defensible, its spread has been helped by the very widely held attitude in academic circles in the United States that all applied science is necessarily inferior to the corresponding "pure" science. And as we all know, attitudes--whether or not they are justified by logic or empirical evidence--affect behavior which in turn produces results that serve to reinforce the originally held attitudes. Thus, it is not surprising that in many instances applied linguistics has become a second-rate discipline and a refuge of those who for one reason or the other could not find happiness in "pure" or theoretical linguistics.

Clearly this is not the way for an intellectual discipline to confront the problems of the world that it encounters through its subject matter and its treatment of it. Hence the notion of linguistics as a resource.

The underlying philosophy here is that all academic disciplines either are, or can become, part of the intellectual resources that mankind has at its disposal in its attempts to cope with its problems. The question that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

arises in this frame of reference is whether a given discipline is adequate as an intellectual resource for dealing with the problems that fall within its province, and if it is not adequate or adequate enough, how can it be made more adequate and more capable of being used as a resource.

If this philosophy is applied to linguistics, then the question to be asked is not "how can we best apply linguistics to help with such and such a problem?" but rather "how well developed is linguistics as a resource to help in coping with this problem, and if it is not well enough developed, how can its development be helped along until it is adequate as a resource?"

Let me add my strong conviction here that in order for linguistics to be adequately developed as a resource it must be conceived broadly, that is, it must not limit itself narrowly to the study of the structure of language only, but it must also encompass with equal thoroughness all the manifold facets of the functioning of language in its individual, cultural, and universally human setting. This means it must open its doors to welcome back into its fold the so-called hyphenated disciplines of ethnolinguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and whatever others there may be.

This much about the notion of ~~language~~ Linguistics as a resource.— Let me now turn to language planning.

In a paper presented a little over a year ago, "Some Comments on Language Planning", I went along with Rubin and Jernudd's definition of language planning as "decision making about language". This definition raises four types of questions: (1) What are the kinds of decisions that are made in language planning? (2) Who are the decision makers? (3) What are the kinds of language or languages that are affected by language planning? (4) What aspects of language are affected by language planning? - In discussing each of these questions I shall attempt to point out the manner in which linguistics can serve as a resource to help arrive at a satisfactory answer.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Types of Language Planning Decisions

There seems to be fairly general agreement in the sociolinguistic literature on language planning that the decisions involved in this process are of two basic types: those pertaining to language choice and those pertaining to language development. Language choice decisions, as the term indicates, have to do with the selection of a particular language for a particular purpose: What language is to be used in education, or in public life, or for purposes of intellectual or cultural development. Language development decisions are concerned with, primarily, the direction in which a given language is to be developed, the extent to which this development is to be carried, and the means by which it is to be accomplished.

As I noted in my above-cited paper, "The factor of deliberate choice is particularly evident in the case of an official language and/or national language." I further observe there "That the most difficult problem of choice arises when the decision has to be made between adopting one of the world languages as an official language or selecting one of the languages of the country as the national and official language--in Kloss's terms, exoglossic versus endoglossic." Let me use this decision problem as an illustration of the relevance of linguistics as a resource in the area of language choice.

The technical and analytic aspects of linguistics may serve to evaluate the structural suitability of the candidate languages being considered in this choice. As I noted in "Some Comments on Language Planning", "Both official and national languages have to have a high level of standardization as a matter of cultural necessity. This means primarily that these languages should have the structural properties of a standard language to the highest possible extent, both that of flexible stability and that of intellectualization." I am indebted to the Prague School linguists of the 30's for these

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

two notions: Vilém Mathesius has formulated the concept of flexible stability; Bohuslav Havránek that of intellectualization. Flexible stability means that a standard language should at the same time be stable enough to provide a reliable frame of reference, and flexible enough to accommodate modifications in line with culture change. Intellectualization means that a standard language is characterized by a tendency towards increasingly accurate and detailed modes of expression, with regard to both terminology and syntactic patterns. Clearly, both of these characteristics are sliding scale properties, and equally clearly they both can be measured on the basis of technical linguistic analysis. The question then is whether the linguistic analysis has covered those aspects of language that are relevant to the determination of the degree of flexible stability and intellectualization, and whether it has been conducted in sufficient detail and with sufficient rigor to make such a determination both reliable and meaningful.

The alternative between an exoglossic and an endoglossic choice of language must also be evaluated from the standpoint of function. As I noted in "Some Comments on Language Planning", an endoglossic national language is characterized by a strong separatist function while an exoglossic official language is characterized instead by a strong participatory function. By separatist function I mean the role that a national language plays in setting off the community of its speakers from other speech communities with which it might be confused, and thereby highlighting its separate cultural identity. By participatory function I mean the role of an official language to "facilitate participation in world-wide cultural developments". From a functional point of view, then, the choice will be made on the basis of whichever of these two functions either predominates in fact or is desired to predominate. While a purely technically and analytically oriented approach to linguistics does not have much to say about this, it is obvious that a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

broadly conceived and functionally oriented linguistics can provide the kind of understanding that is a necessary ingredient in the judicious conception and implementation of language choice decisions.

Let me now turn to language development. As I noted above, the three basic factors to be considered here are the direction and the extent of the development and the means by which it is to be accomplished. Let me now discuss these in turn.

By direction of language development I mean primarily the area or aspect of culture in which language development is most desired by the speech community and/or its leaders. The most relevant distinction here seems to be that between science and technology on the one hand and literary and artistic concerns on the other. This distinction is closely related to the basic problem of language choice discussed earlier, namely, that between an exoglossic official language and an endoglossic national language, particularly from the standpoint of their functions. In many situations, the participatory function in terms of which an exoglossic language might be favored is associated with technology and science, while the separatist function in terms of which an endoglossic language will be given preference is associated with literary and artistic concerns. It is clear that problems of language development arise primarily in the case of an endoglossic national language, although they are not limited to them. In the case of an exoglossic official language one of the important development problems is the adaptation of such a language to the conditions of a new environment. Conspicuous and well known examples of this are the development of English in India and Africa.

It seems to me that the role of linguistics as a resource will differ somewhat depending on whether development is geared in a technological scientific or literary artistic direction. In the first case the emphasis may well be on the development of terminologies, in the second case on that of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

grammatical devices and styles; in neither case will this be an exclusive emphasis--after all, the language of technology is also concerned with grammatical devices and styles, and the language of literature with terminologies. Finally, it must be noted that the branches of linguistics most concerned with this type of study, such as lexicology and stylistics, are--as of now--not conspicuously well developed.

Let me now discuss the question of the extent of language development. Ever since Boas and Sapir, linguists of the Western Hemisphere have maintained that in principle there is no limit to the extent to which a language can be developed. That is to say, in principle the phonological, lexical and grammatical devices in every language are inherently adequate to serve any purpose that the speech community may wish to have served. The question then revolves around the purposes that a given language will have to serve in practice and the development, spontaneously or deliberately planned, that will be associated with it. In principle, one can visualize many degrees of language development; in practice the situation seems to be less complex--most students of language planning will probably agree that there are two basic stepping stones in language development: literacy and standard language development.

Literacy development in a speech community requires primarily a consistent writing system based on linguistically sound and culturally acceptable principles. By linguistically sound I mean what everybody in linguistics means, namely, that there should be reasonable phoneme-grapheme correspondences based on not just phonemic but also morphophonemic principles in line with the structural particularities (both phonemic and morphemic) of the language in question. The question of cultural appropriateness is sometimes given less consideration by linguists concerned with problems of literacy, though it is clearly of more than trivial significance. The writing system which

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

may have to be developed for a particular speech community must conform not only to the internal cultural preferences of that community but also to the broader cultural environment in which it lives. In regard to the internal cultural preferences, I pointed out in an early paper of mine that a tradition of aculturation and contact with particular agents of literacy may well create loyalties and traditions in a speech community that must be taken into account when further literacy planning takes place. As for the external larger cultural environment, a conspicuous example is given by the literacy development of many speech communities of the Soviet Union. As is well known, the official policy of that country is the promotion of literacy development in almost every one of the speech communities that are found on its territory. In the early days of Soviet power, the writing systems for many hitherto illiterate speech communities were developed on the basis of the Roman alphabet; the rationale for this seems to have been at least in part based on linguistic considerations--after all, the phonetic transcriptions that linguists use are based on modifications of the Roman alphabet and consequently a writing system based on phonemic and/or morphophonemic criteria might better be represented by the linguist's preferred alphabet. Later on, the writing systems for most of these speech communities were revised using the Cyrillic alphabet as a point of departure; at least in part the reason for this is of course the tremendous cultural significance of the major Slavic speech communities of the Soviet Union each of which use writing systems based on Cyrillic.

As can be seen from the references to standard language scattered throughout the earlier portions of this paper, standard language development is a significantly more complex process than literacy development. From a linguistic point of view, it can best be characterized as a systematic attempt to achieve and enhance flexible stability and intellectualization for a particular language in the sense in which these properties were defined in the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

previous discussion of language choice. Linguistics here will serve as a resource not, as in the case of language choice, for the evaluation of the state of flexible stability or intellectualization that a given language has achieved, but for the attainment and enhancement of these properties. What has been said in the discussion of language choice about the particular way in which linguistics relates to standardization can be applied, with appropriate modifications based on the difference between evaluation and contribution to attainment and enhancement, to the role of linguistics and standard language development.

Let me finally make a few comments about the means for the attainment of the goals of language development and the relevance of linguistics as a resource to these means.

It may perhaps be reasonable to differentiate between the actual intellectual means for promoting and accomplishing language development on the one hand, and the physical and technological channels through which these means can be applied on the other. As with many other important cultural purposes so here, the two basic intellectual means seem to be persuasion and education. By persuasion I have in mind the promulgation of arguments in favor of language development, by education the transmission of its actual results and achievements. Persuasion can range all the way from friendly consciousness-raising to strong political pressure; education can range through the whole gamut offered by the informal channels of the culture and the various levels of a formal instructional system.

Notwithstanding the rapid development and wide spread of the technology of communication over the past few decades, it seems to me that the most important medium for both persuasion and education to this day remains interpersonal verbal contact. Until recently, the only supplement to this has been the printed page.. Now of course the electronic media constitute an

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

important channel for both persuasion and education. While the printed page by its very nature requires at least a minimal familiarity with the results of language development, this is much less the case with the electronic media and hence it has been assumed that they might turn out to be more effective channels of both persuasion and education. It is far from clear that this is the case, since a great many cultural factors--many of them very poorly known--enter into the picture.

Linguistics may here serve as a resource by furnishing some of the arguments for the process of persuasion and some of the elements of content and method for the process of education. In the area of persuasion, the most important contribution of linguistics, in my opinion, is realism: It can provide arguments in favor of language development that are primarily realistic and practical rather than sentimental. The contribution to education is, at least potentially, far greater: In addition to realism, linguistics can contribute detailed and deep understanding as well as methodological skills. Details of this have been discussed to varying degrees in the preceding sections of this paper and will again be brought up in subsequent sections.

Decision Makers in Language Planning

This is an area which is now beginning to get the attention of sociolinguists as part of the study of language planning processes, as shown in recent work by Joan Rubin and others. While we are as yet far from any definitive insights into the problem, it is possible to formulate some general questions and set out some principles for their consideration.

At the present state of our knowledge of these matters, the following three questions can be raised profitably: 1) What kinds of decision makers are there? 2) What are the ingredients that enter into the decision making process and how do they relate to the decision makers? 3) What is the role of linguistics in all this?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In regard to the first question, I suggest that it may be possible at present to identify, at least tentatively, two basic categories of decision makers in language planning: those that arise spontaneously and informally from within a speech community, and those that are formally and officially appointed by some constituted authority within or above the speech community. Among the first category of decision makers I would place those national and cultural leaders in a speech community that take an interest in language development and spontaneously assume a directing role in their communities' language affairs. Illustrations of this type of spontaneous leadership can be found among the so-called "lesser nationalities" of Central Europe of the early 19th century; the cases of the Czechs and the Serbians are particularly well documented because of interest in the field of Slavic linguistics in standard language development. Official decision makers in language planning are represented by such institutions as academies, ministries of education, or other governmental organizations. The best documented case is that of India, thanks to the work of Das Gupta, a political scientist active in language planning research.

As regards the ingredients in the decision making process, two basic factors can tentatively be singled out: political aims and cultural attitudes. By political aims I mean, of course, the overtly formulated objectives with regard to language planning of governments or other political institutions. By cultural attitudes I mean the attitudes toward language, towards particular languages, and towards language choice and language development, of the speech community itself. Political aims and cultural attitudes may coincide, or they may be discrepant. In the first case, the major objective of the decision makers will be to foster the language attitudes and thereby to help accomplish corresponding political aims. In the second case, the goal of the decision makers will be to change language

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

attitudes in the direction of their political aims. An example of the first type of situation are the cases of Czech and Serbian mentioned above; an example of the second type of situation is the case of Ireland where the political aim of the national government is to foster the use of Irish as a national language. There seems to be a strong discrepancy between this political aim and the attitude of the local population which is one of benign neglect for the Irish language.

Finally, some comments on the role of linguistics and linguists in the process of decision making. In some cases, linguists have actually joined the ranks of the decision makers by achieving cultural leadership status in their speech communities; a conspicuous example of this is the Linguistic Circle of Prague which in the 30's had great prestige among the Czech intelligentsia and was able to influence decision making about Czech language development. In other cases, linguists have at best been able to function as consultants to the actual decision makers, be it in their own speech community or abroad. Given the willingness of decision makers to listen, linguists can provide them with the necessary background about the technically linguistic and the broader attitudinal factors that should be considered in the process of decision making for language planning. The most important contribution that linguists can make in this direction is to foster an approach characterized by linguistic and cultural realism as opposed to the more common sentimentalistic approaches such as purism.

Types of Languages Affected by Language Planning

Let me once again return to my previously mentioned "Some Comments on Language Planning". In that paper I observed that four types of language are affected by language planning; written language (the result of the introduction of literacy into a previously unlettered speech community), standard language, official language, and national language. By contrast I noted

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that the one variety unaffected by language planning is folk speech. Many cases of language planning are thus concerned with the selection of some form or other of folk speech for transformation into a written language and/or standard language, and also with its ultimate adoption as an official language and/or national language. Other cases of language planning are concerned with the selection and/or further development of a previously established written language and/or standard language, sometimes with the ultimate or immediate aim of its adoption as an official language and/or national language. As can be noted, and as I have elaborated in my previously mentioned paper, the notions of official language and national language are particularly important in considerations of language choice, while the notions of written language and standard language are significant in considerations of language development.

I have already discussed the role of linguistics in both language choice and language development in some detail in the preceding section on types of language planning decisions. A few details may be added concerning the aspects of language affected by language planning; this will be discussed in the subsequent section.

Aspects of Language Affected by Language Planning

It is true in a trivial sense that all aspects of language are in some way or another affected by language planning. This is clearly so in the case of language choice: In selecting a particular language, obviously all aspects of that language are included in the selection. In the case of language development the situation is clearly different: Different directions of language development affect different aspects of language. In this connection, let me repeat the point I made earlier in this paper, namely that the two essential stepping stones of language development are literacy and standard language development. Let me then look at the aspects of language involved

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in these two facets of language development. Clearly, in literacy the aspect of language most fundamentally involved is its phonological system. Since in the development of a writing system the so-called phonemic solution is not the only alternative, more than just the phonology is involved: The use of morphophonemic principles in the development of a writing system clearly implies attention to the morphological as well as the phonological system. In addition, since a writing system involves more than just the use of letters for vowels and consonants--it requires the consideration of such factors as the use of spaces between appropriate letter sequences and the use of punctuation marks to delimit larger portions of text--some notions of the boundaries of words or word-like units in the language as well as some notions of syntax have to be taken into consideration in the establishment of a writing system.

In regard to standard language development, I have already mentioned that the achievement of both flexible stability and intellectualization requires attention to matters of terminology, grammatical devices, and style. The development of terminologies is, obviously, primarily a matter of the lexical structure of a language; that of grammatical devices a matter of its grammatical structure. The development of styles involves both the lexical and the grammatical structure, not to mention such additional aspects of the structure and use of language as, for instance, the topic-comment relation or discourse structure. By grammatical structure I mean here both morphology and syntax; it is worth noting that in those languages which have well developed morphology and hence a clear-cut morphology syntax distinction, morphology is often more relevant to the achievement of flexible stability, while syntax is, if not equally relevant to both properties, perhaps somewhat more relevant to the achievement of intellectualization. This is because in many languages with a highly structured morphology there is more fluctuation in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the use of affixal elements than in the use of major syntactic patterns; at the same time, it is clear that because of the role of morphology in syntax and because of the importance of syntax for the achievement of intellectualized forms of expression, both are significant for intellectualization, although the elaboration of syntactic patterns is a more characteristic feature of the intellectualized use of language than any morphologically definable property. In regard to style, I should like to comment briefly on the relation between topic-comment structure and discourse structure on the one hand and grammatical and lexical structure on the other. The little that is known linguistically about topic-comment structure and discourse structure points towards a general principle that these two aspects of the use of language utilize the available grammatical devices, both morphological and syntactic, in order to differentiate between various expressions of the topic comment relation and various ways of organizing the discourse. The Prague School has rightly asserted that a standard language is characterized by a variety of functional styles: technological, scientific, literary, bureaucratic, etc. It is reasonable to suggest that one of the principal ways in which these styles differ from each other is in the kind of topic-comment relations and discourse structures employed in each, as well as in the grammatical devices by which the latter are expressed. In the light of these considerations, as well as in the light of the vastly greater functional significance of a standard language by comparison with simply a written language, it can be underlined once again that standard language development is a far more complex process than literacy development.

*

I have attempted to point out in the preceding what are some of the ways in which linguistic know-how can usefully contribute to language planning. Let me now stress that not all of the linguistic and language-related factors that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

are of importance here are equally well known. I think everyone will agree that linguists have been quite successful in dealing with problems of phonology, morphology, and syntax--even though not too many languages of the world have been adequately described in linguistic terms, the basic tools have been developed in one or the other theoretical frame of reference for attacking these aspects of language. Not so with some of the less obvious aspects of language that I consider of equal importance for language planning, particularly for the more advanced stages of language development--the study of lexical structure, of topic comment structure, of discourse structure, are at present in its bare beginnings.

One of the reasons for this discrepancy in our understanding of different aspects of language lies in the natural development of the field: It may well be asserted that phonology, morphology, and syntax are more central to the technical study of language than some of these other areas. This is, however, not the whole answer. A major reason why linguistics has so far not developed into a sufficiently adequate resource for language planning has been the attitude of the field. By this I mean that much of the work in linguistics has been directed towards aims that were defined by the requirements of particular theoretical approaches. In order for linguistics to make its contribution to the solution of the language problems of the world, linguists will have to pursue not only those aims that are generated from within the field, but will also have to pay attention to the social need for the kind of understanding of language that can become a useful ingredient in a productive approach to language problems. The current interest in sociolinguistics is a good beginning. But it is only a beginning--all of linguistics will have to broaden its scope and look not only inwards but also to the world at large for a definition of its aims and purposes.